



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,562	06/30/2003	Mary Elizabeth Lawson	23952-0142	7254
72386 7590 07/07/2009				
SUTHERLAND II				
SUTHERLAND, ASBILL & BRENNAN, LLC				
999 PEACHTREE STREET				
ATLANTA, GA 30309				
EXAMINER				
KIM, STEVEN S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3685				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/07/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/608,562

Applicant(s)

LAWSON ET AL.

Examiner

STEVEN KIM

Art Unit

3685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8, 9, 13, 15-18, 23, 24, 28, 30-32 and 35-44 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8-9, 13, 15-18, 23, 24, 28, 30-32, and 35-44 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/29/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on April 29, 2009, hereinafter referred to as "amend0409". Claims 1-3, 8-9, 13, 15-18, 23, 24, 28, 30-32, and 35-44 have been amended. Claims 12 and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 10, 11, 14, 25, 27, and 29 were previously cancelled. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 13, 15-19, 23, 24, 28, and 30-44 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/29/09 has been entered.

Specification

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

- "means for storing ..." (claim 44);
- "means for receiving ..." (claim 44);

- "means for determining ..." (claim 44);
- "means for associating ..." (claim 44);
- Immediate payment and posting option (claim 34).

Examiner's Comment

4. The Applicant has cited the reference(s) in the instant application in order to show support for "means for" language in claim 44 in amend0409 (see amend0409, page 15, ¶(02)).

5. In reference to the "algorithm and step-by-step process" example (see amend0409, page 15, ¶(02)), the subject matter is directed toward non-statutory subject. The Examiner will interpret the "algorithm and step-by-step process" to be computer-implemented algorithm stored in the memor(ies) 305, when executed by the processor(s) 303 causes the processor(s) as for "determining ... ". **The Applicant is advised to clarify if the Examiner's interpretation is incorrect in the immediate subsequent amendment/reply.**

6. Based on the applicant's remark in amend0409 (see amend0409, page 15, ¶(02)) along with the Examiner's interpretation (see above) and for prosecution purpose, the following is the list of structure(s) that will be interpreted as structure(s) supporting the "means for" in claim 44:

- Data repository 310 and the respective databases 310A, 310B, 310C in Figure 3 as structure supporting "means for storing ...";

- Communication interface 315, Figure 3 in communication with the network 202, Figure 2 as structure supporting "means for receiving ... "; and
 - Algorithm stored in the memor(ies) 305, when executed by the processor(s) 303 causes the processor(s) as "means for determining ... ".
7. In regards to the phrase "**associating/associate/associated**" in the claims, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, Copyright 1981 defines associate as "to bring together in any various ways (as in memory or imagination)".
8. In regards to the phrase "**lead time**" in the claims, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, Copyright 1981 defines lead time as "the period between the decision to begin a process ... and the completion of the process".
9. In regards to the phrase "**partially**" in the claims, Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, Copyright 1981 defines partially as adverb of partial which is defined as "of or relating to a part rather than the whole".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 30-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
12. Per 1-4, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 30-37, based on Supreme Court precedent (See also *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9

(1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a §101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. In addition, the tie to a particular apparatus, for example, cannot be mere extra-solution activity. See *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

13. An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps.

14. To meet prong (1), the method step should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied. This may be accomplished by having the claim positively recite the machine that accomplishes the method steps. Alternatively or to meet prong (2), the method step should positively recite identifying the material that is being changed to a different state or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed.

15. In this particular case, claim 1 fails prong (1) because the "tie" (e.g. storing, receiving, associating) is representative of extra-solution activity. Additionally, the claim(s) fail prong (2) because the method steps do not transform the underlying subject matter to a different state or thing.

16. Claims 2-4, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 30-37 are rejected similarly as each depends on claim 1.

17. The Applicant is advised to remove the wherein clause and recite device(s) tied to each individual recited steps.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

18. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

19. Claims 1-3, 8-9, 13, 15-18, 23, 24, 28, 30-32, and 35-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

20. Per claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 13, 30, 31, 32, and 35, the claims recite "wherein the prior steps are performed by one or more payment servicing computers". It is unclear as to which payment servicing computer(s) is/are performing the recited individual steps. Furthermore, it is unclear to one of ordinary practitioner which prior steps are performed by one or more payment servicing computers. Claims 2-4, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 30-37 are rejected similarly as each depends on one or combination of the rejected claims.

21. As per claims 2 and 17, the phrase "of the type" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

22. As per claims 2, 3, 17, and 18, the term "highest priority" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "highest priority" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

23. As per claims 3 and 18, the claims recite "a number of instances of receipt".

Without the clarity on receipt of what, the scope is unascertainable. Furthermore, the claims recite "an associated threshold number" but fails recite what the threshold number is associated to/with.

24. As per claims 4, 8, 9, 30, 31, 19, 23, 24, 38, and 39, the claims recite "the payment" (see specifically claims 4 and 19). It is unclear as to which one of the payments the recited "payment" is referring to.

25. As per claims 8 and 23, respective prior claims on which claims 8 and 23 each depends recite "wherein the post-issue event information ... includes at least one of" three information, hence resulting optional on the three information. Claims 8 and 23, however, recite the post-issue event information requires inclusion of posting information.

26. As per claims 9, 31, and 24, the claims recite "wherein the one or more payments is a plurality of payments". The language is contradictory in nature since one payment can not be a plurality of payments.

27. As per claims 9, the claim recites "wherein **the payment lead time is based** at least partially upon the determined average period". The claim language is unclear.

28. As per claim 16-19, 23, 24, 28, and 38-43, the claim is directed towards a system, e.g. a memory, a communications interface, and method, e.g. determine, associate. A single claim which purports to be both a product or machine and a process is ambiguous and is properly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for failing

to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention (Ex Parte Lyell, 17 LISPQ2d 1548 (B.P.A.I. 1990)).

29. As per claims 31 and 39, the claims recite "predetermined depositing adjustment period" and "predetermined settlement adjustment period". However, the claims do not recite positive step of determining depositing/settlement adjustment period.

30. As per claim 41, the recited "payment" in "whether payment would be issued in electronic ..." is ambiguous since the relationship between the recited "payment" in claim 41 and claim 40 is unclear.

31. As per claim 34, the claim recites "immediate payment and posting". The immediate posting is ambiguous since it is unclear what posting is referenced to, i.e. financial account, invoice. Furthermore, the immediate posting by a payee is outside of the scope of the claimed invention.

32. As per claim 36, the claim recites "an account number of the payor associate with the payee". The relationship of account number, payor, and payee is ambiguous. For example, is the payor associated with payee or an account number associate with the payee?

33. As per claim 44, the claim element "means for" is a means (or step) plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to clearly link or associate the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function such that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function. While the written description contain

"mean for" language, the written descriptions fails to clearly link the disclosed structure, material, or acts to the claimed function.

34. Applicant is required to:

- amend the claims so that the claim limitations will no longer be a means plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or
- amend the written description of the specification such that it clearly links or associates the corresponding structure, material, or acts to the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or
- state on the record where the corresponding structure, material, or acts are set forth in the written description of the specification that perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

35. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

36. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 13, 15-19, 23, 24, 28, and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

37. Per claims 1, 16, and 44, the claims have been amended to recite "storing ... wherein each of the one or more payments have a same form of payment". This element is not disclosed in the specification.

38. As per claims 35 and 36, the claims were rejected in the previous office action under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. Claims element "partial payment" is not disclosed in the specification. The Applicant had not cured the original rejection, thus, the rejections stay.

39. As per claims 35, 36, and 41, the claims recite "determination of whether payment ... ", but fail to positively recite the step of determining.

40. As per claim 41, "receive an identification of the payee prior to transmitting the user interface" is not disclosed in the specification. Furthermore, "wherein the user interface presenting the at least two payment option is at least partially generated ..." is not disclosed in the specification.

41. As per claim 44, "means for associating the payment time with the payee" is not disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

42. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

43. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 13, 15-19, 23, 24, 28, and 30-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Background of the Invention in the instant application, hereinafter "Background", in view of US Patent Application No. 2003/0055783, hereinafter referred to as "Cataline".

44. Per claims 1, 16, and 44, Background discloses a computer-implemented method, comprising:

- storing information identifying a payment issue time of each of one or more payments to a payee, wherein each of the one or more payments have a same form of payment (see ¶0020; ¶0024; ¶0029; and ¶0030; wherein clause merely describes payment and do not limit the step of storing);
- receiving post-issue event information associated with each of the one or more payments (see ¶0032; ¶0033; ¶0037);

45. While Background discloses a payment lead time, e.g. electronic payment and non-electronic payment, for payment to the payee issued on behalf of a payor (¶0046), the Background does not disclose determining a payment lead time, based upon the stored information and the post-issue event information, to complete a future payment to the payee issued on behalf of a payor. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention would have recognized that the predictable result based on the definition of lead time, the period between the decision to begin a process ... and the completion of the process (in this case period between a payment issue time and completion of payment), is to determine the payment lead time based upon the stored information, e.g. a payment issue time, and the post-issue event information, e.g. recordation of date/time of completion of payment process.

46. The background does not specifically disclose associating the payment lead time with the payee. The Background, however, discloses a service provider having information that enables remittance, e.g. payment, to be handled in some "improved/optimal fashion" and setting up of payee list including lead time (see ¶0009; ¶0048 - ¶0049). Hence, the predictable result is to associate the determined payment lead time with the payee in order to enable payment in improved/optimal fashion.

47. The Background also discloses wherein the prior steps are performed by one or more payment servicing computers (see ¶0040 - ¶0049).

48. In further reference to claims 16 and 44, the Background discloses Electronic Billing and Payment and electronic Biller Service Provider (see ¶0040). The Electronic Billing and Payment and electronic Biller Service Provider necessarily teach a computer system with a memory, a communications interface, and a processor.

49. As per claim 2, the Background does not specifically disclose wherein the post-issue event information includes a plurality of types of post-issue event information and each of the plurality of types of post-issue event information is associated with a priority level, and further comprising: identifying the post-issue event information of the type having the highest priority level; wherein the payment lead time is determined based at least partially upon the stored information and the post-issue event information having the highest priority level. However, Cataline discloses assigning a priority level, i.e. various weighting, and using the priority level in making determination or predicting, e.g. most effective settlement (see ¶¶0141). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Cataline, technique of utilizing priority level, to Background as both are related to payment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that utilizing weighting factor would provide flexibility in calculating the payment lead time.

50. As per claim 3, the Background does not specifically disclose wherein: the post-issue event information includes a plurality of types of post-issue event information and each of the plurality of types of post-issue event information is associated with a priority level and a threshold number; and the payment lead time is determined based at least partially upon the stored information and the one of the plurality of types of post-event information having the highest priority level for which a number of instances of receipt is greater than an associated threshold number. However, determination based on a number of instances greater than an associated threshold number, i.e. data sampling, is

old and well known at the time of the invention as evidenced by US Patent 6,658,393 (see col. 11, lines 34-60, data sampling and predictive modeling using various technique; Abstract). Furthermore, Official Notice is taken that establishing a threshold number is old and well known in the art of data sampling analysis for predicting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary practitioner at the time of the invention to utilize the old and well known technique of establishing a threshold number of data samples with the motivation of providing accuracy.

51. As per claims 4 and 8, the Background discloses post-issue event information for each of the one or more payments includes at least one of i) posting information identifying a time that the payee posts the payment, wherein the posting information is received from the payee, ii) deposit information identifying a time that the payee deposits a payment instrument associated with the payment at a financial institution, wherein the deposit information is received from at least one of the payee, a payor on whose behalf the payment to the payee is issued, or a financial institution, or iii) settlement information identifying a time that a financial institution that maintains a deposit account upon which a debit associated with the payment is drawn settles the debit, wherein the settlement information is received from at least one of the payor or a financial institution (see ¶0032; ¶0033; ¶0037).

52. As per claims 9, 30, and 31, the claims are directed towards determining post-issue information and determining average period based on the payment issuance time to post-issue information, e.g. time of settlement. Official Notice is taken that determining average of historical event to for prediction is old and well known in the art of data sampling. As prior art teaches determination of payment lead time based on process begin time and end time, data sampling, payment issuance time, and post-issue information, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine the payment lead time based upon the stored information, e.g. a payment issue time, and the post-issue event information using available mathematical algorithm, e.g. determining average, for predicting the payment lead time for best results (*Ex parte Smith*, 83 USPQ2d 1509 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 2007)).

53. As per claim 13, the Background teaches receiving a payment request to pay the payee on behalf of the payor (see ¶0005), the payment request including information identifying a payment due date (see ¶0045); determining a time to issue a payment to the payee to fulfill the payment request by the due date based at least partially upon the determined payment lead time associated with the payee (see above analysis on prior art in reference to determined payment lead time associated with the payee; ¶0045; ¶0046); and issuing a payment to the payee at the determined time (see ¶0045; ¶0046).

54. Per claim 32, while Background discloses Electronic Bill and Payment (see ¶¶0040 - ¶¶0049), the Background does not specifically disclose transmitting a user interface presenting at least two payment options for paying the payee, wherein a first payment option of the at least two payment options includes information associated with the payment lead time associated with the payee; receiving a selection of a first payment option; and issuing payment to the payee in accordance with the first payment option. Cataline, however, discloses a system and methods comprising transmitting a user interface presenting at least two payment options for paying the payee, (see Cataline, ¶¶0045, user interface; Fig. 3, various drop down box for presenting payment options); receiving a selection of a first payment option (see Cataline, ¶¶0045, user interface; Fig. 3, various drop down box for presenting payment options); and issuing payment to the payee in accordance with the first payment option (see Cataline, ¶¶0045, user interface; Fig. 3, various drop down box for presenting payment options; ¶¶004 performing payment; Fig. 6, payment forwarding portion 520). The prior art, e.g. discussed in claim 1, disclose determining the payment lead time associated with the payee. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings in order to utilize the determined payment lead time associated with the payee and to provide flexible options to a payor.

55. As per claim 15, the claim is directed towards the payment option information, specifically a cost to the payor associated with issuing payment. The subject matter is non-functional descriptive material that does not affect the recited steps, e.g. transmitting, receiving, issuing payment, hence will not move to distinguish from the prior art.

56. As per claim 33, the Background discloses a future-dated payment option (see ¶0045).

57. As per claim 34, the prior art discloses an electronic payee and immediate payment and posting (see Background ¶0005; ¶0007; ¶0011; ¶0017; ¶0027; ¶0043; ¶0046; ¶0049; ¶0044; ¶0047; see Cataline ¶0053).

58. As per claim 35, Background further discloses receiving an identification of the payee; processing the identification of the payee to determine whether payment associated with the partial payment information would be issued in electronic or paper form (see ¶0048-¶0049). In regards to wherein the user interface presenting the at least two payment options is at least partially generated based on the determination of whether payment for the payee would be issued in electronic or paper form, the prior art teach user interface, e.g. GUI and Web-based interface (see Background ¶0049; see Cataline Fig. 3).

59. As per claim 36, the prior art further disclose receiving a payment amount (see Background ¶0005).

60. As per claim 37, the prior art also disclose receiving a due date wherein issuing payment to the payee is based at least partially upon the due date (see Background ¶0045; ¶0046).

61. As per claims 17-19, 23, 24, 28, and 38-43, the claims are significantly similar to the rejected claims above. The main difference being that the claims are directed towards apparatus, e.g. processor, rather than method. Furthermore, the claims recite intended use of apparatus that do not limit the claimed apparatus. The claims also recite non-functional materials, e.g. the one or more payments (claim 24), that do not limit the structure of the recited apparatus.

Conclusion

62. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent 6,658,393 that discloses prediction based on data sampling including different predictive modeling technique; US Patent Application No. 2004/0215560 that discloses computer based payment system and method; US Patent No. 5,483,445 that discloses billing consolidation system; US Patent 5,220,501 that discloses remote electronic billpay; US Patent Application No. 2003/0225642 that discloses system and method for transaction triggered cycling of financial account.

63. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEVEN KIM whose telephone number is (571)270-5287. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:30AM - 5:00PM).

64. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt can be reached on (571)272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

65. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 3685

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685